



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

On snow-tipped height of the Andean range  
They planted the statue fair and strange;  
And there, to the query of the sky,  
Its bronze and granite make reply:

"I witness the failure of the sword,  
The victory of the Love-sent word;  
To dust may crumble rock and hill,  
This pledge of nations abideth still."

\* \* \* \* \*

So now the Boundary Line is laid;  
Christ in the heart hath the conflict stayed;  
And now doth "the Christ of the Andes" rest  
In token of Peace on the mountain's crest.

## The Hague Conference.

*From the President's Message.*

The first conference of nations held at The Hague in 1899, being unable to dispose of all the business before it, recommended the consideration and settlement of a number of important questions by another conference to be called subsequently and at an early date. These questions were the following: (1) The rights and duties of neutrals; (2) the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea, and of military budgets; (3) the use of new types and calibres of military and naval guns; (4) the inviolability of private property at sea in times of war; (5) the bombardment of ports, cities and villages by naval forces. In October, 1904, at the instance of the Interparliamentary Union, which, at a conference held in the United States and attended by the law-makers of fifteen different nations, had reiterated the demand for a second conference of nations, I issued invitations to all the powers signatory to the Hague Convention to send delegates to such a conference, and suggested that it be again held at The Hague. In its note of December 16, 1904, the United States government communicated to the representatives of foreign governments its belief that the Conference could be best arranged under the provisions of the present Hague treaty.

From all the powers acceptance was received, coupled in some cases with the condition that we should wait until the end of the war then waging between Russia and Japan. The Emperor of Russia, immediately after the treaty of peace which so happily terminated this war, in a note presented to the President on September 13, through Ambassador Rosen, took the initiative in recommending that the Conference be now called. The United States government in response expressed its cordial acquiescence, and stated that it would, as a matter of course, take part in the new Conference and endeavor to further its aims. We assume that all civilized governments will support the movement, and that the Conference is now an assured fact. This government will do everything in its power to secure the success of the Conference to the end that substantial progress may be made in the cause of international peace, justice and goodwill.

This renders it proper at this time to say something as to the general attitude of this government toward peace. More and more war is coming to be looked upon as in itself a lamentable and evil thing. Wanton or useless war, or a war of mere aggression,—in short, any war begun or carried on in a conscienceless spirit,—is to be

condemned as a peculiarly atrocious crime against all humanity. We can, however, do nothing of permanent value for peace unless we keep ever clearly in mind the ethical element which lies at the root of the problem. Our aim is righteousness. Peace is normally the hand-maiden of righteousness; but when peace and righteousness conflict, then a great and upright people can never for a moment hesitate to follow the path which leads toward righteousness, even though that path also leads to war. There are persons who advocate peace at any price; there are others who, following a false analogy, think that because it is no longer necessary in civilized countries for individuals to protect their rights with a strong hand, it is therefore unnecessary for nations to be ready to defend their rights. These persons would do irreparable harm to any nation that adopted their principles, and even as it is they seriously hamper the cause which they advocate by tending to render it absurd in the eyes of sensible and patriotic men.

There can be no worse foe of mankind in general, and of his own country in particular, than the demagogue of war, the man who in mere folly or to serve his own selfish ends continually rails at and abuses other nations, who seeks to excite his countrymen against foreigners on insufficient pretexts, who excites and inflames a perverse and aggressive national vanity, and who may on occasions wantonly bring on conflict between his nation and some other nation. But there are demagogues of peace just as there are demagogues of war, and in any such movement as this for the Hague Conference it is essential not to be misled by one set of extremists any more than by the other. Whenever it is possible for a nation or an individual to work for a real peace, assuredly it is failure of duty not so to strive; but if war is necessary and righteous, then either the man or the nation shrinking from it forfeits all title to self-respect.

We have scant sympathy with the sentimentalist who dreads oppression less than physical suffering, who would prefer a shameful peace to the pain and toil sometimes lamentably necessary in order to secure a righteous peace. As yet there is only a partial and imperfect analogy between international law and internal or municipal law, because there is no sanction of force for executing the former, while there is in the case of the latter. The private citizen is protected in his rights by the law, because the law rests in the last resort upon force exercised through the forms of law. A man does not have to defend his rights with his own hand, because he can call upon the police, upon the sheriff's posse, upon the militia, or in certain extreme cases upon the army, to defend him. But there is no sanction of force for international law.

At present there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, independent and peace-loving peoples, to disarm, while yet leaving it open to any barbarism or despotism to remain armed. So long as the world is as unorganized as now, the armies and navies of those peoples who on the whole stand for justice offer not only the best, but the only possible security for a just peace. For instance, if the United States alone, or in company only with the other nations that on the whole tend to act justly, disarmed, we might sometimes avoid bloodshed, but we would cease to be of weight in securing the peace of justice—the real peace for which the most law-abiding and high-minded men must at times

be willing to fight. As the world is now, only that nation is equipped for peace that knows how to fight and that will not shrink from fighting if ever the conditions become such that war is demanded in the name of the highest morality.

So much it is emphatically necessary to say in order both that the position of the United States may not be misunderstood and that a genuine effort to bring nearer the day of the peace of justice among the nations may not be hampered by a folly, which, in striving to achieve the impossible, would render it hopeless to attempt the achievement of the practical. But while recognizing most clearly all above set forth, it remains our clear duty to strive in every practical way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations. At present the practical thing to do is to try to minimize the number of cases in which it must be the arbiter, and to offer, at least to all civilized powers, some substitute for war which will be available in at least a considerable number of instances.

Very much can be done through another Hague Conference in this direction, and I most earnestly urge that this nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of the Hague Conference effective. I earnestly hope that the Conference may be able to devise some way to make arbitration between nations the customary way of settling international disputes in all save a few classes of cases, which should themselves be as sharply defined and rigidly limited as the present governmental and social development of the world will permit. If possible, there should be a general arbitration treaty negotiated among all the nations represented at the Conference. Neutral rights and property should be protected at sea as they are protected on land. There should be an international agreement to this purpose and a similar agreement defining contraband of war.

During the last century there has been a distinct diminution in the number of wars between the most civilized nations. International relations have become closer, and the development of the Hague Tribunal is not only a symptom of this growing closeness of relationship, but is a means by which the growth can be furthered. Our aim should be from time to time to take such steps as may be possible toward creating something like an organization of the civilized nations, because as the world becomes more highly organized the need for navies and armies will diminish. It is not possible to secure anything like an immediate disarmament, because it would first be necessary to settle what peoples are on the whole a menace to the rest of mankind, and to provide against the disarmament of the rest being turned into a movement which would really chiefly benefit these obnoxious peoples; but it may be possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure. Of course, such an effort could succeed only if it did not attempt to do too much, and if it were undertaken in a spirit of sanity as far removed as possible from a merely hysterical pseudo-philanthropy.

It is worth while pointing out that since the end of the insurrection in the Philippines this nation has shown its practical faith in the policy of disarmament by reducing its little army one-third. But disarmament can never be of prime importance; there is more need to get

rid of the causes of war than of the implements of war.

I have dwelt much on the dangers to be avoided by steering clear of any mere foolish sentimentality, because my wish for peace is so genuine and earnest; because I have a real and great desire that this second Hague Conference may mark a long stride forward in the direction of securing the peace of justice throughout the world. No object is better worthy the attention of enlightened statesmanship than the establishment of a surer method than now exists of securing justice as between nations, both for the protection of the little nations and for the prevention of war between the big nations. To this aim we should endeavor not only to avert bloodshed, but, above all, effectively to strengthen the forces of right. The Golden Rule should be, and as the world grows in morality it will be, the guiding rule of conduct among nations as among individuals; though the Golden Rule must not be construed in fantastic manner as forbidding the exercise of the police power. This mighty and free republic should ever deal with all other states, great or small, on a basis of high honor, respecting their rights as jealously as it safeguards its own.

## The Peace Movement and Germany.

*From a German Point of View.*

BY DR. ERNST RICHARD, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

It seems to be the settled opinion of a great many friends of the peace movement, even of some German pacifists, that Germany is the one peace disturbing element of Europe. If Germany only would give back Alsace-Lorraine to France, reduce her army and abolish her navy, then harmony would reign supreme! Some friends of peace seem to be almost willing to urge war on Germany to avoid an imaginary breach of peace on her part. Coalitions are proposed of the "most civilized nations" to secure peace, and in a great many of these propositions Germany is left out, not being advanced far enough in civilization. One prominent philanthropist, who formerly used to include Germany in his benevolent plans of federation, has dropped her of late, and is reported to have given as an explanation that Germany would always be a second class power which could be considered a negligible quantity. If I add that Mr. Delcassé and King Edward have been praised in peace meetings and peace journals as the greatest promoters of peace, I have given a selection of opinions which, although not by any means the official expression of the representatives of the peace movement, still are voiced frequently enough to raise the question: Do the people who express these views think that the goodwill of Germany is not desirable or necessary to promote the cause of the peaceful settlement of international difficulties? That I should receive an affirmative answer to this question is, of course, not to be assumed.

Certainly the attitude of Germany does not appear at all friendly towards pacifism, and it will be a very difficult task to convince her — that is, her government and the majority of her people — that she can protect her peaceful development in any other way than by an army of surpassing strength and a navy sufficient to protect her coast line. This feeling of Germany is due principally to her historical development, of which I shall say